



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,662	07/20/2001	Ziya Aral	DAT-0002	2628
23353 7590 01/12/2010 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER TRAN, NGHI V	
			ART UNIT 2451	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/12/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES

6
7 *Ex Parte* ZIYA ARAL, RONI PUTRA, ALISTAIR D. BLACK,
8 YONJIAN REN, and WENLEI MAO

9
10 Appeal 2009-006253
11 Application 09/910,662
12 Technology Center 2400

13
14 Oral Hearing Held: November 19, 2009

15
16 Before MAHSHID D. SAADAT, CARLA M. KRIVAK, and
17 CARL W. WHITEHEAD, JR., *Administrative Patent Judges*.

18
19 APPEARANCES:

20 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:

21 CHRISTOPHER M. TOBIN, ESQUIRE
22 Rader, Fishman & Grauer, PLLC
23 1233 20th Street, N.W., Suite 501
24 Washington, D.C. 20036

25
26 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing Thursday, November
27 19, 2009, commencing at 11:25 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
28 Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Deborah Courville, a
29 Notary Public.

30
31

P R O C E E D I N G S

JUDGE SAADAT: Begin when you're ready. Thank you.

MR. TOBIN: May it please the Board, as mentioned, I'm Chris Tobin and I'm here representing the Appellant and the Assignee in this case, Data Core Corporation.

I understand today's time is limited and I'd like to discuss some of the basic grounds of rejection and some of the prior art that's been relied upon. We don't wish to forego any of the arguments that have been briefed and are willing to discuss any and all elements of the pending Final Office Action as needed.

The main point of discussion I'd like to hit on today is whether the Examiner has erred in rejecting various claims as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,823,336, Srinivasan, which I will call the 336 Patent.

We do have separate arguments in the Briefs for separate groups of those claims and we'd like those to be treated separately. But, initially and primarily, I'd like to focus on the rejection of the independent claims.

As a way of introducing what we're dealing with here today, I'd like to initially discuss traditional mirroring versus what is done in Applicant's claimed invention. In traditional mirroring, you'll take a dedicated high-speed line, and you have a local storage side and a remote storage side, and what you do in that traditional mirroring is you send the right transactions that are intercepted on the primary side, or local side, and send those over to the secondary side, or remote side. And that is essentially what you're doing. You're replicating the right transactions at another location, so that you end up having a disk that matches your local disk in some fashion. And

1 there're all kinds of techniques for making that faster on the host side, or the
2 local side, or making it more efficient, by reducing the amount of data that
3 you have to send from one side to the other. But essentially that's what's
4 going on in mirroring.

5 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Excuse me. If I can interrupt you for a
6 minute, what are you defining as write transactions?

7 MR. TOBIN: A write transactions is a disk -- a request to write to the
8 disk at the disk level. In the claims, there are I/O transactions and there are
9 write transactions. I/O transactions is the superset, if you will. Write
10 transactions -- I/O transactions could, of course, encompass read or write
11 transactions. So you're either reading from or writing to the disk, according
12 to an I/O transaction. Does that answer your question?

13 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Yes.

14 MR. TOBIN: In Applicant's claimed invention, we have what's
15 referred to as an asynchronous mirrored storage, where we're interrupting
16 the I/O transactions of the local storage system, and then we're encapsulating
17 write transactions, and putting those into regular file system files, which
18 contain the write transactions, and then we're sending those files over to the
19 other side. And you don't have to just wire over transactions in this fashion.
20 You could use any nonproprietary communications protocol in order to get
21 these files from one side to the other.

22 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Is the write transaction -- or, are the write
23 transactions common data or is -- I mean if I'm going to back up my -- the
24 way I was looking at it was if I'm going to back up my system, right, and I'm
25 going to back up a file, let's say, if you have jpgs or a if I have Word

1 documents, whatever, I have in that file, when I'm backing up that file,
2 would that be considered to be backing up my write transactions as well?

3 MR. TOBIN: When you're backing up a file, is it backing up the
4 write transactions? Not necessarily. It could possibly be done in that
5 fashion. But you could take a file -- for example, if you had a file -- if you
6 had a picture of your cat, and cat.jpg, and you just took that. If you were
7 viewing it from a file level, you could take that file and then just send that
8 entire file over to some remote location and store it at that location.

9 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Right.

10 MR. TOBIN: That file, in and of itself, does not contain the write
11 transactions themselves. We tried to bear that out in the claims, by saying
12 that we have the exact copy of the write transactions in these files that we're
13 sending from the local disk to the remote disk.

14 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: But --

15 MR. TOBIN: So while it's possible, it's not necessarily true, given
16 that -- given a presumption that you've backed something up.

17 And I think that's a major point here, is that the Examiner keeps
18 referring to this data set that is in the 336 patent, and that data set is -- I
19 would call it a convenient way to refer to the fact that it's a convenient
20 depiction that you're using to show that you've got a data set here and a data
21 set there.

22 But what the 336 patent is merely doing is this traditional mirroring,
23 where it's just sending the write transactions over the wire and then
24 performing the write transactions at the secondary side.

25 It has not provided this -- what Applicant has provided, which is a
26 very convenient way, without a high-speed, dedicated line, to get those write

1 transactions over to the other side. So you don't need the dedicated
2 infrastructure, the high-speed line, or anything like that. You're just putting
3 them in normal file system files, and you've sequenced those write
4 transactions within these files that you've created, and you've also sequenced
5 the series of files, so that you'll have coherency on the remote side when you
6 go to recompile what has occurred.

7 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: And I don't mean to keep interrupting you,
8 but you said the 336 patent actually sends the write file or the write
9 transactions over. It mirrors it.

10 MR. TOBIN: There -- it is a disk mirroring operation.

11 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Right, so the data set --

12 MR. TOBIN: It does send write transactions from the local to the
13 remote.

14 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Okay.

15 MR. TOBIN: It does not intercept them and encapsulate them in file
16 system files, as we have claimed, however.

17 JUDGE SAADAT: What is the difference? I mean if the interception
18 creates a duplicate data set, or a duplicate copy, what -- does it matter if the
19 duplicate is made before transaction or after, or separately?

20 MR. TOBIN: Or concurrently.

21 JUDGE SAADAT: Or concurrently.

22 MR. TOBIN: It -- we couldn't say that that's not a duplication,
23 because it's then -- it's existing in two places. I agree with you on that.
24 What we've done is provide the convenience of providing the coherency of
25 data on the remote side in a fashion that puts them into these special files
26 that we have.

1 We're not -- going back to my example, when you're mirroring a disk,
2 and the Examiner has noted that in the 336 patent, it says you could store
3 volumes, files, whatever, you know.

4 You know, those are not the files we're talking about. We're not
5 talking about cat.jpg. We're talking about our file that we use to accomplish
6 the mirroring. So, of course, naturally in the 336 or any mirroring operation,
7 if you're mirroring a disk, if you have on disk A, a bunch of files, you know,
8 a.dat, b.dat, whatever it may be, and you've fully replicated that disk,
9 including its file system, if you will, then of course all of that stuff is going
10 to be repeated on the other side.

11 I believe the claims are clear that that's not what we're doing. We're
12 taking -- we're intercepting the write transactions issued to the storage disk.
13 We're making an exact copy of a series of write transactions, and we're
14 storing the exact copy within a series of files that are created on the file
15 system of the local storage system.

16 So that's a much different level of abstraction than what's going on in
17 the 336 patent or traditional mirroring. That's much lower in the layering, if
18 you will. They're just taking those bottom-level write transactions and
19 zipping them over to the other side. Whether they do it synchronously or
20 asynchronously, it doesn't matter. When they refer to asynchronous and
21 synchronous, it has to do with when you tell the host application that it's free
22 to do something else. That's not the issue. The issue is where it's occurring
23 and how those instructions are getting sent from point A to point B, and we
24 submit that it's a clearly different way that it's being done in the 336 patent,
25 as compared to what is currently in the claims.

1 JUDGE SAADAT: So the word intercepting doesn't mean it's at a
2 particular point that it's intercepting, because that's another --

3 MR. TOBIN: Well, the term -- we've gone over the term I/O
4 transaction, so necessarily, when we're talking about I/O transactions being
5 these disk-level transactional commands, you're necessarily performing that
6 interception at that -- it's a disk-level operation, is what we're talking about,
7 so --

8 JUDGE SAADAT: So it's right before it --

9 MR. TOBIN: I think your question may be geared at, you know, if I
10 say the write -- when I say copy my document.dat, is that a write transaction.
11 We believe that the record's clear that that's a higher level file system write
12 command and not the I/O transaction that is being referred to in the claim.

13 JUDGE SAADAT: So the reference, in your opinion, lacks that
14 interception or the type of write transaction?

15 MR. TOBIN: I think the -- where the Examiner's position breaks
16 down is in a couple of areas. Again, the Examiner is calling this data set.
17 He's calling this data set.

18 JUDGE SAADAT: Right.

19 MR. TOBIN: The exact copy of the write transactions that's getting
20 intercepted, retained and stored in the series of files. But, as I've mentioned,
21 even if the data set is composed of files, that's -- in the 336 patent, it's just
22 stuff stored on the disk. It does not mean that you're taking these write
23 transactions and putting them into special files.

24 Then there's another piece, where we say that the series of files, the
25 series of files that we've already said store the I/O transactions, are
26 transmitted from the local to the remote storage system. So if we're going

1 with the analogy of the Examiner, it breaks down again there, because the
2 data set itself is never transmitted from one side to the other. You'll end up
3 having a replication on the other side, but the data set is not itself sent over
4 the wire.

5 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: In Figure 1, it says the write command
6 transaction of the 336 patent. If it's -- I guess what I'm missing out, is if we
7 have exact mirror images, how is that data not being sent over to the remote
8 area?

9 MR. TOBIN: Ultimately, it is there. I mean, it's just the way that it's
10 getting there I think is how you have to view that, and it's being done in a
11 different fashion in Applicant's claim, as compared to the 336 patent.

12 If you -- you know, there's various ways to get from point A to point
13 B. I could take a train to Philadelphia or I could drive to Philadelphia. I
14 would end up in Philadelphia, but it's a totally different way of getting there.
15 And I think that the claims reflect distinctions over the way that the
16 mirroring has been performed in the 336 patent.

17 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: And let me see if I understand what you're
18 saying about Claim 1. So you have a series of write transactions issued to
19 said storage disk. You make an exact copy of those series of write
20 transactions. I'm looking at -- I'm sorry, I'm looking at Claim 1 of your
21 Brief. Okay. Now, so you're saying you set those in a separate file from
22 the so-called regular data?

23 MR. TOBIN: Correct. We're not just saying we're replicating a file.
24 All the mirroring is going to do that. We have this file that's used to
25 accommodate the operation. So we're intercepting the write transactions,
26 and then we're putting them in this file, and then we're moving that file and

1 other files over to the remote side in order to carry out the mirroring
2 operation.

3 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Right, but the claim doesn't say that you're
4 making a separate file of the write transactions. It says you're making an
5 exact copy of the series of write transactions. Couldn't that be in the same
6 file as the other data?

7 MR. TOBIN: Okay. And we're talking about the results. The results
8 of the write transactions is not the same as the write transactions themselves.
9 So, if you're replicating a special file on the local disk onto the remote disk,
10 it does not necessarily entail, in and of itself, the write transactions
11 themselves. It's the result of a series of write transactions.

12 And, you know, by the way, when you're writing to a disk, you can
13 have one location that's written to, and, you know, you can change a zero to
14 a one, and then, for whatever reason, write over that and change it back to a
15 zero, change it back to a one again, change it back to a zero. Those are all
16 write transactions. The end net result is not necessarily even reflected in the
17 resultant storage block on the disk itself. Essentially, those write
18 transactions evaporate, unless you have a way of keeping track of it.

19 Now, conventional systems keep track of things, but they do it in a
20 different way from the way that's been claimed by Applicant.

21 JUDGE SAADAT: But if the reference transmits the write commands
22 or transaction --

23 JUDGE KRIVAK: Write transactions.

24 JUDGE SAADAT: -- yeah, write transactions, why wouldn't that be
25 the same as the claim transmission of write transactions? They are -- there is
26 a --

1 MR. TOBIN: We are transmitting write transactions.

2 JUDGE SAADAT: Yes.

3 MR. TOBIN: But in a different vehicle.

4 JUDGE SAADAT: What is that vehicle? The file?

5 MR. TOBIN: The files.

6 JUDGE KRIVAK: The series of files?

7 MR. TOBIN: The series of files. The series of write transactions
8 within a file and then a compilation of a series of files, but, yes, write
9 transactions are going from point A to point B.

10 JUDGE SAADAT: So in -- you're suggesting that I should read your
11 claim to mean that a series of files is a particular vehicle that these write
12 transactions are transmitted with -- by?

13 MR. TOBIN: Correct. You could characterize it that way. And the
14 vehicle that we've provided is this series of files that are -- they're file system
15 files of the local storage system.

16 JUDGE SAADAT: A series of files that are created on a file system
17 of the local storage system?

18 MR. TOBIN: Correct. Now the file system is also a term of art and,
19 you know, the file system is the way that the files are organized on a
20 computer from the user-level perspective, if you would. This is not raw --
21 the files in the file system are not raw block data. It's at a lower level of
22 abstraction.

23 JUDGE SAADAT: I'm okay with that.

24 Do you have any other questions?

25 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: No, I'm good.

26 JUDGE SAADAT: Carla?

1 JUDGE KRIVAK: No more questions.

2 JUDGE SAADAT: If that's it, we are, I guess, clearly briefed then.

3 Thank you so much for your explanation.

4 MR. TOBIN: All right. Thank you for time and have a good day.

5 JUDGE WHITEHEAD: Thank you.

6 JUDGE KRIVAK: Thank you.

7 (Whereupon, the proceedings, at 11:43 a.m., were concluded.)

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.
Court Reporting Transcription
D.C. Area 301-261-1902